

REMARKS

Claims 45-54 are presented for consideration, with Claims 45, 48 and 51-54 being independent.

The independent claims have been amended to further distinguish Applicants' invention from the cited art.

Claims 45, 48 and 51 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being obvious over Choudhury '074 in view of DeBry '728. Claims 46 and 49 are rejected as allegedly being obvious over those citations and further in view of Bauer '047. Claims 47 and 50 are rejected as allegedly being obvious over Choudhury, DeBry, and Takagi '853. Finally, Claims 52-54 are rejected as allegedly being obvious over Choudhury in view of Van Buren '816. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 45 of Applicant's invention relates to a method of controlling peripheral equipment connected to a network and managed by a directory server on the network. The method includes a first receiving step of receiving a print job issued from an information processing apparatus on the network together with a first access ticket issued from the directory server, with the directory server being separate from the information processing apparatus, a storing step of storing the received print job to a storing medium, a first decrypting step of decrypting the first access ticket received with the print job, and a first control step of determining validity of the first access ticket received based on the decrypting results and limiting execution of the print job received. Additional steps include a second receiving step of receiving a management command from an information processing apparatus on the network

together with a second access ticket issued from the directory server, at a timing independent of the first receiving step, with the directory server being separate from the information processing apparatus, a second decrypting step of decrypting the second access ticket received together with the management command, and a second control step of determining validity of the second access ticket received based on the decrypting result and limiting execution of the management command.

As recited in Claim 45, where the management command received in the second receiving step is one for deleting a specific print job stored in the storing medium, the second control step compares user information in the decryption results of the second decrypting step with user information in the decryption results of the first decrypting step and limits execution of deleting the specified print job in the storing medium if the user information in the decryption results of the second decrypting step does not correspond to the user information in the decryption results of the first decrypting step. In addition, execution of deleting the specified print job in the storing medium is enabled if the user information in the decryption results of the second decrypting step corresponds to the user information in the decryption results of the first decrypting step.

Claims 48 and 51 are directed to a peripheral equipment apparatus and a computer readable storage medium, respectively, and correspond to Claim 45.

Claim 52 of Applicant's invention relates to a method of controlling peripheral equipment connected to a network and managed by a directory server on the network, and includes a first receiving step of receiving a print job issued from an information processing

apparatus on the network together with an access ticket issued from the directory server, with the directory server being separate from the information processing apparatus, a storing step of storing the print job received in the first receiving step to a storing medium, a first decrypting step of decrypting the access ticket received together with the print job, and a first control step of determining validity of the received access ticket based on the decrypting result and limiting execution of the received print job. In addition, an obtaining step obtains from the directory server access information corresponding to a specific user, an inputting step inputs a management command from an operation panel of the peripheral equipment, and a second control step determines validity of the obtained access information and limits execution of the management command.

Claim 52 also recites that where the inputted management command is one for deleting a specified print job stored in the storing medium, the second control step compares user information in the access information with the user information in the decryption results of the first decrypting step and limits execution of deleting the specified print job in the storing medium if the user information in the access information does not correspond to the user information in the decryption results of the first decrypting step. Execution of deleting the specified print job in the storing medium is enabled, however, if the user information in the access information corresponds to the user information in the decryption results of the first decrypting step.

Claims 53 and 54 are directed to a peripheral equipment apparatus and a computer readable storage medium, respectively, and correspond to Claim 52.

As will be appreciated, the independent claims have been amended to make it clearer when a specific print job can be deleted. In Claims 45, 48 and 51, execution of deleting a specific print job will be enabled if user information in the decryption results of the second decrypting step corresponds to user information in the decryption results of the first decrypting step. In Claims 52-54, execution of deleting a specific print job is enabled if the user information in the access information corresponds to the user information in the decryption results of the first decrypting step. Support for the claim amendments can be found, for example, in Figure 31, step S1620, and the corresponding specification beginning on page 49, line 18.

The primary citation to Choudhury relates to cryptographic techniques for sending encrypted information between a document server 103 and a display agent 111 and/or a printing agent 113 (see Figure 2). The Office Action relies on the Choudhury patent for a teaching of a first receiving step, a storing step, a first decrypting step, and a first control step of determining validity of a first access ticket or an access ticket.

The secondary citation to DeBry relates to a system for controlling information between the user (client) 20, a document source 10, and a print server 30 (see Figure 1). With respect to independent Claim 45, DeBry is said to include the steps of a second receiving step of receiving a management command, a second decrypting step, and a second control step. DeBry is also said to teach that where a management command received in the second receiving step is one for deleting a specific print job stored, a second control step determines whether or not user information in the decryption results of the second decrypting step corresponds to the user

information in the decryption results of the first decrypting step and limits execution of deleting the specified print job in the storing medium.

In contrast to Claim 45 of Applicant's invention, however, neither Choudhury nor DeBry is understood to teach or suggest, among other features, enabling execution of deleting a specified print job in the storing medium if the user information in the decryption results of the second decrypting step corresponds to the user information in the decryption results of the first decrypting step. In this regard, the portion of DeBry relied on in the Office Action, i.e., column 9, lines 28-35, is read to limit end users to only submitting print jobs but not to cancelling such print jobs.

It is submitted, therefore, that the patents to Choudhury and DeBry do not teach or suggest use of a first access ticket and a second access ticket in the manner set forth in Applicant's Claim 45 for controlling a management command for deleting a specified print job. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 45, 48 and 51 under 35 U.S.C. §103 is respectfully requested.

The secondary citation to Van Buren relates to a digital image processing apparatus and is relied on, with respect to Claim 52, for teaching an obtaining step, an inputting step, and a second control step. Van Buren is also said to teach that where the management command input is one for deleting the specified print job, the second control step compares user information in the access information with user information in the decryption results of the first decrypting step and limits execution of deleting the specified print job in the storing medium. As understood, however, in Van Buren when an operator wants to have a specific data file printed, the operator

gives a command via an apparatus operator control panel 160. After that data file has been printed, it remains stored in the storage unit until it is removed by a user himself or a manager of the apparatus (see column 6, line 56 through column 7, line 8).

It is respectfully submitted, however, that Van Buren fails to teach or suggest, among other features, comparing user information in the access information with the user information in decryption results of a first decrypting step and enabling execution of deleting a specific print job if the user information in the access information corresponds to the user information in the decryption results. Choudhury fails to compensate for these deficiencies in Van Buren. Accordingly, the proposed combination of art, even if proper, still fails to teach or suggest Applicant's invention as set forth in Claims 52-54, and thus reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. §103 is respectfully requested.

The tertiary citation to Bauer is relied on for teaching decryption results. Bauer fails, however, to compensate for the deficiencies in Choudhury and DeBry as discussed above. Accordingly, without conceding the propriety of combining the art as proposed in the Office Action, such a combination still fails to teach or suggest Claims 46 and 49. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 46 and 49 under 35 U.S.C. §103 is thus respectfully requested.

The tertiary citation to Takagi is relied on for its teaching of a management command for displaying a job list. Takagi fails, however, to compensate for the deficiencies in Choudhury and DeBry as discussed above. Accordingly, without conceding the proposed combination of art, such a combination still fails to teach or suggest Applicant's invention as set forth in Claims 47

and 50. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. §103 is therefore respectfully requested.

Thus, it is submitted that Applicant's invention as set forth in independent Claims 45, 48 and 51-54 is patentable over the cited art. In addition, dependent Claims 46, 47, 49 and 50 set forth additional features of Applicant's invention. Independent consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of this application is deemed to be in order and such action is respectfully requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Scott D. Malpede/

---

Scott D. Malpede  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 32,533

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

SDM/vmm

FCHS\_WS 3880575v1